



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,581	12/29/2003	Robert E. Higashi	H0005015-1100.1237101	8573
90545	7590	12/03/2010		
HONEYWELL/STW Patent Services 101 Columbia Road P.O. Box 2245 Morristown, NJ 07962-2245			EXAMINER ECHELMEYER, ALIX ELIZABETH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1729	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/03/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

honeywell_uspto@stwiplaw.com
patentservices-us@honeywell.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/750,581

Applicant(s)

HIGASHI ET AL.

Examiner

Alix Elizabeth Echelmeyer

Art Unit

1729

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 29, 31-34, 36, 37, 39-45, 47-56 and 58-70 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 29, 31-34, 36, 37, 39-45, 47-56 and 58-70 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/10/10
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response

1. This Office Action is in response to the arguments filed September 10, 2010. No claims are amended, cancelled, or added. Claims 29, 31-34, 36, 37, 39-45, 47-56, and 58-70 are pending and are rejected finally for the reasons given below.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement filed June 10, 2010 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language, specifically JP 666787. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

3. The information disclosure statement filed June 10, 2010 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed, specifically, no copy of either of the non-patent literature documents has been provided. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Declarations

4. The Declarations are not convincing to overcome the prior art date of the references. The examiner holds that the Declaration filed April 14, 2010 is not convincing because it does not contain the specific claim language of the instant claims, and therefore is not commensurate in scope with the claimed invention. The Declaration merely states that the Declarants have reviewed and understand the *specification*, and that the fuel cell was made in accordance with the *invention*. The examiner has no way of knowing whether the embodiment shown in Figure 2 of the Declaration is the same embodiment found in the instant claims. If Applicant were to file a Declaration indicating that the fuel cell was made in accordance with the instantly *claimed* invention, it would be more effective in pre-dating the prior art reference.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 29, 31-34, 36, 37, 39-45, 47, 48, 54-56 and 58-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leban (US 7,049,024) in view of Blunk et al. (US 6,942,941).

Regarding claim 29, Leban teaches a membrane electrode assembly including a first electrode layers having apertures, a second electrode layer having apertures, and a proton exchange membrane having catalyst on both sides of the membrane (abstract,

Fig. 9). Leban further teaches that the proton exchange member is adhered to the electrodes with an adhesive film by lamination (abstract).

As for claims 31 and 32, the membrane of Leban is Nafion®, a sulfonated polytetrafluoroethylene, and the catalyst is platinum (column 2 lines 46-50).

With further regard to claim 29 and regarding claims 33, 34, 36, 37, and 39-43, the electrodes of Leban are formed by providing electrode layers of a conductive material and depositing electrode material on the layers (column 2 lines 36-40). Thus, the entire of the electrode is conductive and in electrical contact, which one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize to be an inherent characteristic because of the need to conduct the electricity formed in the fuel cell to the applied load.

Regarding claims 61 and 62, Leban teaches a lamination process that involves only one adhesive layer (column 4 lines 46-48).

As for claim 70, it is clear that the electrodes are made of a continuous material (see Figs. 1-10).

With regard to claim 47, Leban teaches an electrode assembly but fails to teach that the electrodes are made of insulating materials with conductive coatings applied thereon.

As for claim 48, the membrane includes catalyst on both surfaces (abstract).

Regarding claim 68, one of ordinary skill in the art would realize that the anode would inherently be in communication with a fuel reservoir, since fuel cells require fuel

in order to operate and since fuel would necessarily be provided in a reservoir since, unlike oxidant, it is not readily available from the atmosphere.

As for claims 54 and 63, Leban teaches the electrode assembly and lamination method, as discussed above, but fails to teach the electrodes are made of insulating materials with conductive coatings applied thereon.

With regard to claim 55, Leban teaches cutting each cell from a roll of laminated cells (column 5 lines 5-10).

As for claims 56, 58, 59 and 65, the contacts of the cells of Leban are located on the surfaces of the electrodes opposite the membrane surface (Fig. 9; column 4 lines 15-19).

Regarding claim 64, Leban teaches catalyst on both sides of the membrane (abstract).

As for claim 66, Leban teaches adhesive between the membrane and electrodes (Fig. 8).

With further regard to claim 29, and regarding claims 60 and 67, Leban fails to teach explicitly that the adhesive is conductive.

Blunk et al. teach a fuel cell using electrically conductive adhesive to bond components (abstract).

Blunk et al. further teach that the use of conductive adhesive enables current generated by the cell to be passed to the load without overheating the cell, based on the resistance of the adhesive (column 2 lines 57-67).

One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that an electrically conducting adhesive such as the adhesive of Blunk et al. would be desirable for use in Leban, since the adhesive would allow for the electrons generated across the membrane to be transported to the electrodes, where they are collected and applied to the load.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a conductive adhesive such as the adhesive of Blunk et al. in the fuel cells of Leban in order to provide a path for the electrons generated in the membrane to be delivered to the load.

As discussed above in reference to claims 47, 54 and 63, and further regarding claims 44, 45, and 69, Leban fails to teach that the electrode is made of an insulating material with a conductive material provided on the surface, including the surface (inside walls – see Fig. 4 of instant disclosure) of the apertures.

Blunk et al. teach bipolar plates, which the examiner interprets to be the same as the electrodes of the instant invention. This interpretation is made because the bipolar plates of Blunk et al. and the electrodes of the instant invention serve the same purpose - to deliver reactants to the membrane, and to conduct electricity to the load.

Blunk et al. teach that the bipolar plates may be made entirely of conductive material, as in the case of Leban, or they may be made of conductively coated polymer plates (column 4 lines 45-67).

It would be desirable to use conductively coated polymer plates, such as those of Blunk et al., instead of entirely conductive plates, such as those of Leban, since such a substitution may result in a lighter fuel cell in the instance that the coated plates of Blunk et al. are lighter than the plates of Leban, or in a less expensive fuel cell in the instance that the materials of the plates of Blunk et al. are less expensive than those of Leban.

One of ordinary skill in the art, based on the teachings of Leban and Blunk et al., specifically Figure 4 of Blunk et al., would certainly be capable of making the electrodes having the same structure as those of Leban but with conductive coating on all exposed surfaces, including the inner walls of the apertures, based on the Blunk et al.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use conductively coated polymer plates, such as those of Blunk et al., instead of entirely conductive plates, such as those of Leban, since such a substitution may result in a lighter fuel cell in the instance that the coated plates of Blunk et al. are lighter than the plates of Leban, or in a less expensive fuel cell in the instance that the materials of the plates of Blunk et al. are less expensive than those of Leban.

7. Claims 49-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leban in view of Blunk et al. as applied to claim 47 above, and further in view of Badding et al. (US 2002/0102450).

The teachings of Leban and Blunk et al. as discussed above are incorporated herein.

Leban in view of Blunk et al. teach a thin fuel cell but fail to teach the instantly claimed dimensions.

Badding et al. teach a fuel cell apparatus having thicknesses for various components of 0.1 to 50 microns, which is desired in order to provide a current path while overcoming the resistivity of various materials ([0052]).

It would have been desirable to create parts of the fuel cell of Leban in view of Blunk et al. as small as possible, such as in the dimensions of Badding et al., in order to create a fuel cell that was very thin but still functioned to overcome the resistivity of the materials used.

It has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. MPEP 2144.05 (IIB). For example, in each claim the thickness is considered. Since the thickness is a result effective variable as taught by Badding et al., yet the thickness is also desirably minimized, then it would be obvious over Leban in view of Blunk et al. in further view of Badding et al. to find the optimum thickness value.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed April 14, 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Declarations have been discussed above.

As to Applicant's arguments, beginning on page 11, these arguments have been previously addressed, in the Final Rejection mailed December 14, 2009, and provided below.

Applicant argues that because the bipolar plate of Blunk et al. is a bipolar plate and not an electrode plate, the skilled artisan would be unable to make the above described combination.

The examiner disagrees. As stated above, the skilled artisan would be capable of using a bipolar plate in place of a conductive plate since both distribute reactants and conduct electricity. The teaching of conductive layers on both sides of a plate used to conduct electricity is relied upon in this instance, and it would be well within the ordinary level of skill in the art to see that aspects of a bipolar plate, which serves a similar purpose as an electrode current collector, could be used to improve a current collector for a single electrode.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alix Elizabeth Echelmeyer whose telephone number is (571)272-1101. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ula Ruddock can be reached on 571-272-1481. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ula C Ruddock/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795

Alix Elizabeth Echelmeyer
Examiner
Art Unit 1729

aee